

CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN, YOUNG PEOPLE AND FAMILIES' SERVICES

**Venue: Town Hall, Moorgate
Street, ROTHERHAM.
S60 2TH**

**Date: Wednesday, 19th September,
2012**

Time: 9.00 a.m.

A G E N D A

1. To determine if the following matters are to be considered under the categories suggested in accordance with the Local Government Act 1972.
2. To determine any item which the Chairman is of the opinion should be considered as a matter of urgency.
3. Apologies for absence.
4. Minutes of the previous meeting held on 18th July, 2012. (Pages 1 - 6)
5. National Children and Adult Services Conference.
 - Eastbourne, 24th - 26th October, 2012.
6. Performance Indicators Children and Young People's Services Performance Indicator Report - 2011/12 Outturn. (Pages 7 - 21)
7. Proposal for a strategic approach to respond to the DfE SEN Green Paper 'Support and Aspirations: a New Approach to Special Educational Needs and Disability'. (Pages 22 - 26)
8. Proposal for a Joint Health, Social Care and Education 'Children, Young People and Families' Commissioning Group'. (Pages 27 - 33)
9. Independent Chair of Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children Board - Waiving of Standing Orders. (Pages 34 - 35)
10. Exclusion of the Press and Public

The following item is likely to be heard in the absence of the press and the public as being exempt under Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended March 2006) (information relating to

the financial or business affairs of any particular individual (including the Council)).

11. Use of Resources at Ulley Activity Centre. (Pages 36 - 39)
12. Children and Young People Services, Annual Comment and Complaint Report - 2011/2012. (Pages 40 - 51)
13. Date and time of the next meeting: -
 - Wednesday 17th October, 2012, to start at 9.00 am in the Rotherham Town Hall.

**Date of Next Meeting:-
Wednesday, 17th October, 2012**

**Membership:-
Cabinet Member:- Councillor Lakin
Councillors Beaumont(Senior Advisor), Dalton (Advisor) and Havenhand
(Adviser)**

**CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN, YOUNG PEOPLE AND FAMILIES' SERVICES
18th July, 2012**

Present:- Councillor Lakin (in the Chair); Councillors Dalton and Beaumont.

D23. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 4TH JULY, 2012.

The minutes of the previous meeting of the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families' Services were considered.

Resolved: - That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Cabinet Member be agreed as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

D24. COMMISSIONING OF EARLY HELP FOR ROTHERHAM FAMILIES NOT ENGAGED WITH CHILDREN'S CENTRES.

Consideration was given to the report submitted by the Strategic Commissioning Manager, Resources Directorate, which outlined proposals to undertake a pilot project in conjunction with the children and young people's voluntary and community sector consortium. The proposed pilot would identify families with at least one child who were not currently engaged with a Children's Centre.

It was proposed that the project would run in the Dinnington and Thrybergh areas, as both had higher than average levels of deprivation and lower than average levels of engagement with Children's Centres. The pilot would run for nine-months and would also serve as a test model for engaging families within statutory services.

The stated aims of the proposed pilot project were: -

- Engage families not actively involved with Children's Centres or other similar services, and identify if they required help;
- Identify whole family issues that may be causing concern;
- Help families resolve their issues in a constructive and inclusive way;
- Connect families to their local community to make the best use of their local resources and services;
- Signpost or support families to gain help where their needs were greater and required specialist intervention;
- Where there may be gaps in services, encourage local support in the community to be explored and developed.

There would be ten 'Delivery Partners' within the project and each would provide a Family Engagement Project Co-ordinator who would be responsible for the identification of families that required help, and link them to the appropriate voluntary and community sector consortium provider.

Analysis of the project would be undertaken by Children England, a national charity that worked with children and families. Part of Children England's strategic partnership work was for the Department for Education and involved developing commissioning arrangements with the local voluntary and

community sector in light of the provisions of the Localism Act, 2011. Children England would develop a strategic work programme that would demonstrate the project's impact. It was anticipated that the model could be used to demonstrate social and economic returns on investments.

Discussion ensued in relation to the proposed pilot, and the following issues were raised and clarified: -

- Working across local authority boundaries;
- Professional skill level of the Family Engagement workers, and the areas of knowledge that would be required in relation to provision offer, parenting skills, engagement skills and local knowledge;
- Working holistically to include both children's and adults' services;
- Role of the project in the Early Help Strategy, that sought to address family issues before they required formal intervention.

The Cabinet Member noted the finance available for the proposed project, as well as the risks and uncertainties of a time-limited project that may not be adequate to support families with complex needs.

Resolved: - (1) That approval be given to undertake the project in conjunction with the children and young people's voluntary and community sector consortium and Children England, as outlined in the submitted report.

(2) That a further report be presented to the Cabinet Member outlining the outcomes of the project when it was completed.

D25. SCHOOL BALANCES 2011/2012.

Consideration was given to the report submitted by the Principal School Finance Officer, CYPs Business Partnering, Financial Services, Resources Directorate. The report contained information as at 31st March, 2012, and included an update on: -

- The overall position;
- Individual schools' balances.

There was a significant increase in school balances at the close of the 2011/12 financial year to 138%, which equated to £8.71 millions. This had increased from £3.658 millions at the close of the 2010/11 financial year.

The overall balance at each phase at the end of the 2011/12 financial year was noted: -

- Primary schools – increased by 78%;
- Secondary schools – increased by 582%;
- Special schools – increased by 45%;
- Early Excellence Centres – decreased by 9%.

The balance increases were largely due to the delegation of former centrally held grants, from the Local Authority to individual schools, and the introduction of the Pupil Premium grant. These included: -

- Dedicated Schools' Grant (DSG);
- Additional Extended Services balances being allocated to schools;
- Additional Pupil Premium grant that had been received.

It was noted that 31 schools had a balance above the threshold set by the Department of Education (8% for a primary or special school; 5% for a secondary school), compared to 6 schools at the close of 2010/11.

The Department for Education (DfE) announced in the autumn term 2010 that it would no longer require individual local authorities' 'Scheme for Financing of Schools' to have a balance control mechanism:-

"The scheme may contain a mechanism to clawback excess surplus balances. Any mechanism should have regard to the principle that schools should be moving towards greater autonomy, should not be constrained from making early efficiencies to support their medium-term budgeting in a tighter financial climate, and should not be burdened by bureaucracy. The mechanism should, therefore, be focused on only those schools which have built up significant excessive uncommitted balances and/or where some level of redistribution would support improved provision across a local area."

Local Authorities should, therefore, consider removing or relaxing their existing mechanism with effect from 1st April 2011.

The Rotherham Schools' Forum agreed to retain the existing mechanism for the financial year 2011/2012, therefore schools with balances above the threshold have completed a return providing reasons for the given level of balances being held, along with a forecast plan of how they intend to utilise this sum over a three-year period.

A sub-group of the Rotherham Schools' Forum would be convened to consider whether to apply a clawback of the funding following consideration of the returns.

At the close of the 2011/12 financial year, there was a reduction in the revenue deficit balance in the primary and secondary phase of £824k. Only one secondary school held a significant deficit balance, for which a three-year deficit recovery programme was in place. At the close of the 2010/11 financial year there were 14 schools reporting a deficit position. At the close of the 2011/12 this had decreased to 7 schools.

Table one of the submitted report demonstrated Rotherham's performance against comparator authorities.

Discussion ensued on the content of the report: -

- Some Learning Communities had pooled funding and the amount was being held in one individual school's budget;
- Some Pupil Premium Grant funding had not been spent in year.

The Cabinet Member expressed concerns at the level of the overall balance positions, and in particular where Pupil Premium Grant funding had not been spent in-year to benefit individual children.

The Cabinet Member expected the Strategic Director for Children and Young People's Services to give a clear message that schools should utilise funding in-year.

Resolved: - That the overall position of Rotherham's school balances be noted.

D26. MEMBERSHIP OF SUB-GROUPS, WORKING PARTIES, PANELS AND REPRESENTATIVES ON OUTSIDE BODIES FOR THE MUNICIPAL YEAR 2012/13.

Resolved: - That the following appointments to Sub-Groups, Working Parties, Panels and Representatives on Outside Bodies for the Municipal Year 2012/13 be confirmed: -

Adoption Panel: -

Councillors Falvey, Havenhand and Sharman.

Fostering Panel: -

Councillors Pickering and Sharman.

Redbarn Rowan Management Group: -

Councillors Burton and Falvey.

Rotherham Holiday Aid: -

Councillors Havenhand and Beaumont.

Rotherham Children and Young People's Trust Board: -

Councillor Lakin, Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families' Services.

Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children Board: -

Councillor Lakin, Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families' Services.

Think Family Strategic Group: -

Councillor Lakin, Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families' Services, along with Councillors Burton and Beaumont.

Local Admissions Forum: -

Councillors Barron, Havenhand and Beaumont.

Visits to Children's Establishments: -

Councillor Lakin, Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families' Services, together with Advisers.

Chairman or Vice-Chairman of the Improving Places Select Commission.

Ward Councillor.

Education Consultative Committee: -

Leader and Deputy Leader.

Councillor Lakin, Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families' Services, together with Advisers.

Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board.

Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Improving Lives Select Commission.

Rotherham Schools' Forum: -

Councillor Lakin, Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families' Services.

Standing Advisory Council for Religious Education: -

Councillors Beaumont, Havenhand, Hussain and Sharman.

Hospital Teaching and Home Tuition Service: -

Councillor Dalton.

Transport (Education) Appeals Panel

Councillors Dodson, Gosling, Rushforth and Whelbourn (vacancies).

Rotherham College of Arts and Technology Board: -

Councillor Licence.

Thomas Rotherham College Board: -

Councillor Barron.

Dearne Valley College: -

Mr. Matthew Gladstone, Director, Commissioning, Policy and Performance, Resources Directorate.

LEA Governors' Panel: -

Councillor Lakin, Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families' Services, together with Advisers.

Councillor Sims.

Inspire Rotherham Limited: -

Councillor Lakin, Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families' Services and Mrs. Dorothy Smith, Director, Schools and Lifelong Learning, Children and Young People's Services.

Yorkshire and Humberside Children and Young People Lead Member Network: -

Councillor Lakin, Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families' Services.

Yorkshire and Humberside Grid for Learning – Foundation Board: -

Mrs. Susan Wilson, Performance and Quality Manager, Commissioning, Policy and Performance, Resources Directorate.

Wales Education Foundation: -

Councillors Whysall and Beck.

18D

CHILDREN, YOUNG PEOPLE AND FAMILIES' SERVICES - 18/07/12

D27. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND THE PUBLIC.

Resolved: - That, under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended March 2006) (information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular individual (including the Council)).

D28. ASTON HALL JUNIOR AND INFANT SCHOOL - PROVISION OF TEMPORARY CLASSROOM.

Consideration was given to the report submitted by the Principal Capital Projects Manager, Audit and Asset Management, Resources Directorate, which outlined the tendering process for the provision of a modular classroom for Aston Hall Junior and Infant School to address rising pupil numbers in the school's catchment area.

Resolved: - That the tender submitted by Wernick Hire dated 13th July, 2012, be accepted.

D29. DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING: -

Resolved: - That the next meeting take place on Wednesday 19th September, 2012, commencing at 9.00 am in the Rotherham Town Hall.

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS
--

1.	Meeting:	Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families' Services
2.	Date:	19th September 2012
3.	Title:	<p>Performance Indicators Children and Young People's Services Performance Indicator Report - 2011/12 Outturn Appendix A – Performance Assessment by Corporate Plan Priorities Appendix B – CYPS Performance Monitoring Table – 2011/12 Outturn</p>
4.	Directorate:	Children and Young People's Services and Resources

5. Summary

This report and accompanying appendices outline performance at the end of 2011/12 outturn against targets, with direction of travel against previous year's performance and comparisons with statistical neighbour and national data.

The basket of indicators for 2012/13 will be revisited to reflect the government priorities and emerging themes

6. Recommendations

- **That the Performance Report be received and performance noted**
- **The report is submitted to the Children, Young People and Families' Partnership for their information.**

7. **Proposals and Details**

Members' attention is drawn to 'Appendix A - Performance Assessment by Corporate Plan Priorities' which provides details of performance by each Corporate Plan Priority relating to CYPS activity including;

- Performance against targets (Comparing performance against set targets)
- Direction of travel analysis (Comparing 2011/12 outturn performance to 2010/11 outturn performance)
- Performance against Statistical Neighbours average
- Performance against National average

Full details of performance and commentary at indicator level are provided in the table within Appendix B which is referenced throughout the Performance Assessment (Appendix A).

8. **Finance**

There are no financial implications to this report. The relevant Service Director and Budget Holder will address financial implications of the Action Plans. Members will be consulted where appropriate

9. **Risks and Uncertainties**

A category of risk is applied to each Performance Indicator using the PI managers' projection of year-end performance and takes into account any known internal or external influences with comparison against targets.

10. **Policy and Performance Agenda Implications**

Changes have recently taken place in relation to the OFSTED profile, this is no longer published by OFSTED however locally this is reproduced in relation to the inspected settings and is used by Directors and Managers as a tool to drive up performance.

11. **Background Papers and Consultation**

Children and Young People's Services Performance Indicator Reports, Quarters 1 to 3.

Contact Name: Stephen Booth Service Improvement Officer
Tel: [82]2619 stephen.booth@rotherham.gov.uk

Rotherham Children and Young People's Services

Assessment of Performance by Corporate Plan Priorities

2011/12 Outturn Report

This report outlines performance at the end of 2011/12 outturn against targets, with comparisons against previous performance and statistical neighbour and national data where possible.

It should be read in conjunction with the 'CYPS Performance Monitoring Table – 2011/12 Outturn (Appendix B) as it includes references throughout the text to the numbering structure within the table.

Please note the following;

- This report has been amended to report the indicators under the corporate plan priorities instead of the Every Child Matters Outcomes. These are;
 - Making sure no community is left behind.
 - Providing quality education; ensuring people have opportunities to improve skills, learn and get a job.
 - Ensuring care and protection are available for those people who need it most.
 - Helping create safe and healthy communities.
 - Improving the environment. (Currently there are no CYPS indicators under this priority)

- A new criteria for RAG rating indicators has been implemented and is detailed below;

Definition of new RAG Status	Target Met	Stat Neighbour Avg Met	National Avg Met	New RAG Status
Performance is achieving the local target and above the Ofsted comparator (could be Statistical Neighbour or National Avg depending on the indicator)	✓	✓	✓	GREEN
Performance is not achieving the local target and on or above the Ofsted comparator (could be Statistical Neighbour or National Avg depending on the indicator)	x	✓	✓	AMBER
Performance is below local target and Ofsted Comparator	x	x	x	RED

- Comparative data relates to the latest available data and therefore date periods for some indicators may vary. It has been sourced via the DFE Local Area Interactive Tool.

Corporate Plan Exception Report (RAG rated Red)

Priority 1 - Making sure no community is left behind

Proportion of children living in poverty (No 1 / NI 116)

This indicator is measured by the proportion of children living in households where income is less than 60% of the national median and is classed as 'relative low income'. It is published annually each autumn and there is a significant time lag of two years thus meaning that the 2011 figure relates to 2009.

Using this measure, child poverty levels have increased locally showing a negative direction of travel in 2009 to 23.3% of children in Rotherham living in a household with relative low income up from 22% in 2008.

Child poverty levels remain higher than the target of 21.6%, the national and regional averages of 21.3% and 21.9% respectively but are still lower both the statistical neighbour average of 24.2% and the South Yorkshire average of 24.1%.

The variation of child poverty at neighbourhood level is vast. Child poverty in Rotherham Super Output Areas (SOAs) ranges from 1.9% to 57.5% in some areas. The table below shows the child poverty levels at the 11 neighbourhoods defined by Super Output Area (SOA) where deprivation is particularly high (amongst the most deprived 10% in England):

Neighbourhood	Super Output Area	% of Children in "Poverty"
Aston North	Aston North West	41.9%
Canklow	Canklow North	57.5%
Dalton & Thrybergh	Dalton	48.3%
	Thrybergh South	42.1%
	East Herringthorpe East	38.8%
	Thrybergh East	29.6%
Dinnington Central	Dinnington Central	44.5%
East Dene	East Dene North	51.6%
	East Dene East	49.7%
	Herringthorpe North	40.4%
	East Dene South	40.4%
East Herringthorpe	East Herringthorpe North	55.9%
	East Herringthorpe South	45.1%
Eastwood	Eastwood East	47.5%
	Eastwood Central	40.6%
	Eastwood Village	34.2%
Ferham & Masbrough	Meadowbank	41.3%
	Masbrough	40.6%
	Ferham	38.0%
Maltby South East	Maltby East - Maltby Main	49.5%
	Maltby East - Muglet Lane	47.8%
	Maltby East - Town Centre	31.6%
Rawmarsh East	Rawmarsh North East	50.0%
Town Centre	Town Centre	30.4%

The Council and partners are working on a number of initiatives to try and ensure child poverty does not increase further:

- Rotherham has implemented a Government initiated programme to turnaround 700+ of its most troubled families.
- Rotherham has also re-launched its Early Help Strategy; one of the strategic objectives identified in the strategy is 'to mitigate the effects of child poverty (including health inequalities) by supporting families to fulfil their potential.' If the strategy is successful it will have long term impacts on rates of poverty in the borough.
- Support pathway is being developed for Children's Centres to support parents achieve economic wellbeing. Early Years and Children's Centres co-ordinating Adult and Family Learning package for children's centre delivery with both RMBC colleagues and external PVI training providers.
- We are targeting support for our most vulnerable groups including EU migrants and new arrivals through the development and implementation of the child poverty measures detailed in the EU migration action plan. This plan is currently being reviewed and finalised and work is ongoing to commission skills for life and community learning to deliver ESOL courses to new arrivals. We have been delivering 2 pre-school ESOL classes a week at Ferham and the Unity Centre since October 2011.
- A performance clinic was held on 22nd February 2012 and the following actions were agreed;
 - The use of pupil premium in schools is assessed and its impacts determined.
 - Best Practice would be sought in relation to Child Poverty using the work from Joseph Rowntree.
 - Market the credit union within RMBC and provide Cllrs Akhtar and Lakin with the relevant forms for circulation at the Labour Group Meeting on 6th March 2012.
 - Examine ways to ensure that people claim what they are entitled too and encourage people to come forward if they feel they have financial difficulties.

Priority 2 – Providing quality education; ensuring people have opportunities to improve skills, learn and get a job

Achievement at level 4 or above in both English and Maths at Key Stage 2 (No 4 / NI 73)

In 2011 Key Stage 2 performance showed a 2.8% increase to 69.3% in the percentage of pupils achieving L4+ in both English and Maths, when compared to Rotherham schools' performance in 2010. This indicates that Rotherham is narrowing the gap to the national average as the national improvement was 1% up to a 2011 figure of 74%. Using the DFE data matrix released in October 2011 this performance ranks us as 143rd out of 152 local authorities but using year on year improvement rankings we are 42nd out of 152.

All schools have signed the Rotherham School Improvement Partnership mission. Local Authority Powers of Intervention have been established to work with schools that are vulnerable to falling below KS2 floor standards or data indicates underperformance. Consultant Headteachers' will work within Learning Communities, particularly with regard to the quality of learning and teaching, and leadership and management.

Achievement of 5 or more A*-C grades at GCSE or equivalent including English and Maths (No 5 / NI 75)

2011 data shows that GCSE results rose for the 9th successive year. 5+A*-C including English and mathematics rose to 56.3%. This is however, below the target of 57.5% and is also below the national average of 58.3%. Rotherham improved by 5.5% from 2010 showing a faster rate of improvement against the national average increase of 4.9% thus narrowing the gap. Using the DFE data matrix this ranks us 95th out of 152 for performance and 17th out of 152 for year on year improvement.

Achievement of a level 3 qualification by the age of 19 (No 9 / NI 80)

2011 performance of 44.9% showed an increase of 1.2% from 2010 and continues the upward trend in this indicator. Rotherham remains below the national average of 56.7%.

In line with the current Government agenda of Raising the Participation Age, The Rotherham RPStrategy Group is focused on:

- Increasing post-16 **participation** in learning, particularly amongst 17 and 18 year olds.
- Improving **retention** in post-16 learning, especially between 17-18 year olds/Year 12-Year13
- Improving **attainment** outcomes at Key Stage 2, 4 and 5
- Improving 11-19 **progression** pathways through a coherent and joined up curriculum offer.

Inequality gap in the achievement of a Level 2 qualification by the age of 19 (No 11 / NI 82)

Performance in 2011 of 28% showed that the achievement gap has increased from 25% in 2010. In actual terms, more young people in Rotherham are now eligible for FSM, and more of them have achieved L2 by 19, but in percentage terms, the FSM gap has increased.

Secondary schools judged as having good or outstanding standards of behaviour No 12 / NI 86)

2011/12 performance of 66% equates to 8 out of 12 schools have good or outstanding standards of behaviour. This is a drop from 69% in 2010/11 but it must be noted that previously 16 schools were counted. The conversion of 4 schools to Academies has had a negative impact on this indicator as 3 of these schools were judged as good or outstanding. Schools are not inspected on an annual basis so movement towards targets can be slow

Progression by 2 levels in English between Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2 (No 16 / NI 93)

2011 results show that performance of 80% was an improvement of 1% from 2010. This is well below the target of 95% and remains below both the statistical neighbour average of 84.2% and the national average of 83%. Using the DFE data matrix this ranks us 131st out of 152 for performance and 6th out 152 for year on year improvement.

Progression by 2 levels in Maths between Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2 (No 17 / NI 94)

2011 results show that performance of 79% was an improvement of 0.7% from 2010. This is well below the target of 92% and remains below both the statistical neighbour average of 83.7% and the national average of 82%. Using the DFE data matrix this ranks us 127th out of 152 for performance and 16th out 152 for year on year improvement.

Looked after children reaching level 4 in Maths at Key Stage 2 (No 19 / NI 100)

2011 performance of 45.5% comprised of 10 out 22 young people achieving. This was a disappointing result, with two young people not achieving predictions. Five young people out of this cohort didn't take the sats exam due to their own personal circumstances. Twenty of this cohort are School action plus or had a statement of Special educational need. The planned improvement in tracking will improve the monitoring of this group.

Looked after children achieving 5 A*-C GCSEs (or equivalent) at Key Stage 4 (including English and Maths) (No 20 / NI 101)

2011 performance of 4.2% comprised of 1 out 24 young people achieving. The original prediction is set some time prior to the young people taking their exams and was set on a cohort of 30 and was a very challenging target. As of September 2011 this cohort had reduced to 24 with a number of the high achievers leaving care. Some of whom the Get Real Team had been working with. This shows the transitional nature of this group and the impact this can have on final results. Other young people in the cohort didn't achieve their predicted Grades due to their care circumstances this included foster placement breakdown

Amongst the final group four young people were in special schools. One young person in the group was held back a year and therefore did not sit any exams and another young person was not engaging with services and also refused to undertake any exams.

Even though this cohort didn't achieve the prediction for 5 A-C Including English and Maths eight did achieve 5 A-C in other subjects.

Achievement gap between pupils eligible for free school meals and their peers achieving the expected level at Key Stages 2 and 4 (No 21 / NI 102)

KS2

2011/12 performance of 26% showed that the FSM Rotherham gap has increased by 3% from 2010/11. The attainment for pupils eligible for FSM remains at 48% in 2011. However, the achievement of pupils not eligible for FSM increased from 71% to 74% hence the widening of the gap. Nationally 58% of pupils that were eligible for FSM achieved L4+ in English and mathematics, this is 10% above the Rotherham average.

KS4

Rotherham gap increased by 1.2% in 2011. The attainment of pupils eligible for FSM increased by 4.9% (from 24.4% to 29.3%). However, pupils not eligible for FSM increased by 6.1% (from 55.3% to 61.4%) hence the widening of the gap.

Improvements that are required to meet future targets include;

- Targeted Intervention for FSM pupils
- Partnership working through Learning Communities and targeted intervention
- Schools will be held accountable on how they have used the pupil premium funding and the achievement of FSM pupils will be published.

The Special Educational Needs (SEN)/non-SEN gap - achieving Key Stage 2 English and Maths threshold (No 23 / NI 104) and achieving 5 A*-C GCSE inc. English and Maths (No 24 / NI 105)

2011 performance of 54% at KS2 saw the achievement gap in Rotherham reduce by 2% from 2010. This is a greater than the national reduction of 1%, but we still have a greater achievement gap than both the national and statistical neighbour averages.

2011 performance of 50% at GCSE saw the achievement gap in Rotherham increase by 1%. We still have a greater achievement gap than both the national and statistical neighbour averages.

The (RoSIP) SEN sub group was developed to research SEN outcomes across Rotherham schools and identify key ways forward. The group includes Headteachers, the LSS Leader and the Assistant Head of SES. As part of the recommendations RoSIP / TSA have agreed to fund 'Achievement for All' (AfA) in Rotherham schools.

AfA is a framework that aims to improve provision for children with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND). 30% of Rotherham schools have expressed an interest. Preparation and training will take place during the Summer term for the implementation of the framework in September. This will involve:

- Identifying a group of lead schools and target schools
- Develop the capacity of AfA coaches to work with target school

16 to 18 year olds who are not in education, training or employment (NEET) (No 25 / NI117)

Rotherham has achieved an outturn of 7.6% for the period November to January against a predicted 7.8%. The mean for statistical neighbours was marginally lower at 7.5%. The three month average for Not Knowns stands at 4.8% whereas the same for statistical neighbours is 8.3%. Rotherham has concentrated effort on ensuring data is as robust and current as possible given the addition of 19 year olds being included in the count.

Improvements that are required to meet future targets include;

- Achieving match between provision and learner needs
- Developing provision to support young people who are not ready for learning

Priority 3 – Ensuring care and protection are available for those people who need it most

Percentage of core assessments for children's social care that were carried out within 35 working days of their commencement (No 28 / NI 60)

At the end of March 2012 performance against this indicator stood at 69.4% (1345 of 1937 assessments completed in 35 days) against a national average target of 75.1%. Performance was impacted negatively by the effort that went in to completing out of time core assessments by year end in order to minimise the amount of 'drag' (those assessments incomplete and already out of time) carried over to 2012/13. This has resulted in only 5 out of time cases being carried over, compared to 207 in 2011/12. Going forward this places the authority in a much stronger position to achieve and exceed the national average, and as at the end May 2012 performance stands at 90%.

Timeliness of placements of looked after children for adoption following an agency decision that the child should be placed for adoption (No 29 / NI 61)

As at the end of March, performance stands at 50% against a national average target of 74%. The 50% figure equates to a total of 26 adoptions having taken place since April, of which 13 children were placed for adoption within the 12 month period following their SHOBPA decision.

The total number of Shobpas still 'live' on the system is 91. Of these 18 are currently in the process of being revoked due to change of plan, leaving a total of 73 against which 30 children are already placed and active family finding is taking place for the remaining 43 children. Of the 73 Shobpas 34 were agreed over 12 months ago.

The adoptions team and performance team are working together on eradicating delays and improving performance through:

- Improved tracking, monitoring and reporting of children with Shobpas
- Identification of internal delays in the process (BPR exercise)

The Service Manager in discussion with DCS is progressing increased family finding resource/training resource along with the invest to save bid

The 2012/13 local target for number of adoptions will be agreed later this month

It should be noted that the loss of membership of the East Midlands Consortium in favour of the Yorkshire and Humber Consortium (which has taken time to establish) has impacted on performance this year.

Stability of placements of looked after children: length of placement (No 31 / NI 63)

As at the end of March 2012, actual performance on the preceding 12 months activity is 64.19% which equates to 95 children out of 148 who have been looked after continuously for at least 2.5 years in a placement which has lasted for 2 years. This makes performance lower than the national average target of 68% for 2010/11.

Significant concerns in relation to the data quality of this indicator were identified in September following receipt of validated year end figures. These have now been addressed and revised validation procedures are now in place and reported performance is accurate.

Priority 4 – Helping create safe and healthy communities

Take up of school lunches (No 38 a & b / NI 52 a & b)

Take up of primary school lunches was 46.8% at outturn showing a positive direction of travel from 46.4 in 2010/11. It is however, below the target and the statistical neighbour average both of which are 49.2%.

Take up of secondary school lunches was 35.7% at the end of 2011/12 showing a positive direction of travel from 35.4% in 2010/11. This however, is below the statistical neighbour average of 45.8% and the both the target and national average of 37.6%.

The service has increased the overall take up of meals compared to 2010-11 although the significant increases achieved in previous years has not been replicated. Meal Numbers per day have risen but the impact was offset by the increase in number of pupils on roll. There has been a slight increase in the number of meals served impacting on the PI as numbers on roll reduced slightly.

For both sectors the targets set reflect the average take up for our statistical neighbours – the service aims to achieve these levels; requiring to add 522 primary and 360 secondary meals per day

Marketing initiatives have been implemented and these include a new School Meals starter booklet, theme days to try and stimulate take up of school meals and targeting of specific schools to address meal take up.

Obesity among primary school age children in Year 6 (No 40a / NI 56a)

Performance of 22% shows a negative direction of travel from 20% last year and is also below the statistical neighbour average of 20.3% and the national average of 19%.

Childhood Obesity review event and Performance Clinic held in 2011/12. Children's weight management services continue to be commissioned and seeing increased uptake. Obesity Strategy Group continues to promote access to both preventive and treatment services and activities. Risk to weight management services during PH transition to LA has been raised and is under review.

Childhood obesity strategy, model and action plan for prevention and treatment agreed by NHSR, RMBC and partners is now fully operational and is regularly reviewed and adapted to ensure services are both targeted at and taken up by those who will benefit from them.

CYPS Performance Monitoring Table – 2011/12 Outturn

							Latest Comparative Data							
No.	Ref	Definition	Good Perf	10/11 Perf	11/12 Target	11/12 Outturn	Commentary	DOT (Yr on Yr)	Stat. Neigh.	National	On target	Met SN	Met National	RAG Status
Making sure no community is left behind.														
1	NI 116	Proportion of children in poverty	LOW	22%	21.6%	23.3%	Child poverty levels have increased locally showing an increase in 2009 to 23.3% of children in Rotherham living in a household with relative low income up from 22% in 2008. Child poverty levels remain above the national and regional averages of 21.3% and 21.9% respectively but are still below the South Yorkshire average of 24.1%. The variation of child poverty at neighbourhood level is vast. Child poverty in Rotherham Super Output Areas (SOAs) ranges from 1.9% to 57.5% in some areas.	↓	24.2%	21.3%	x	✓	x	RED
Providing quality education; ensuring people have opportunities to improve skills, learn and get a job														
2	NI 53	Prevalence of breastfeeding at 6–8 weeks from birth												
a	a	Prevalence	HIGH	29.2%	32.0%	30.2%	Breastfeeding prevalence rate is 30.2% and has continued on an upward trajectory from the 2010/11 position of 29.2%. We have achieved a one per cent increase, which is below the 2% yearly increase and the agreed target of 32%. The small improvement reflects the community training and peer support across the Borough, but also suggests the need for continued prioritising.	↑	27.4%	45.2%	x	✓	x	AMBER
b	b	Coverage	HIGH	98.7%	97.0%	97.4%	(Direction refers to comparison to last year)	↓	96.9%	93.6%	x	x	✓	AMBER
3	NI 72	Achievement of at least 78 points across the Early Years Foundation Stage with at least 6 in each of the scales in Personal Social and Emotional Development and Communication, Language and Literacy	HIGH	56.4%	54.8%	58.30%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was an increase in results of 1.9% in 2011. This is 0.7% below the national average. The statutory target was exceeded by 3.5% 	↑	57.6%	59.0%	✓	✓	x	GREEN
4	NI 73	Achievement at level 4 or above in both English and Maths at Key Stage 2 (Threshold)	HIGH	66.5%	79.0%	69.3%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This indicator has increased by 2.8% in 2011 against a national increase of 1%. The results are well below the statutory targets set by schools. Rotherham is 4.7% below the National average. Support to schools is detailed in the delivery plan 	↑	74.6%	74.0%	x	x	x	RED
5	NI 75	Achievement of 5 or more A*-C grades at GCSE or equivalent including English and Maths	HIGH	50.8%	57.5%	56.7%	The improvement of 5.9% in 2011 was 0.4% above the national average increase. This has narrowed the gap to national averages to 2.2%. Results are only 0.8% below the target. Improvement in the standards for both English and Mathematics A*-C contributed towards the increase in this indicator. All Rotherham schools are above the DfE floor standard 5+A*-C including English and mathematics.	↑	55.2%	58.9%	x	✓	x	RED
6	NI 76	Reduction in number of schools where fewer than 60% of pupils achieve level 4 or above in both English and Maths at KS2	LOW	13	N/A	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The number of schools below the floor standard was reduced by one in 2011. This is 14% of our schools against a national average of 10%. Of the thirteen primary schools which were below the standards in 2010, ten were above the standard for 2011. Three schools remained below the floor standards. 	↑	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
7	NI 78	Reduction in number of schools where fewer than 35% of pupils achieve 5 or more A*-C grades at GCSE or equivalent including GCSEs in English and Maths	LOW	0	0	0	The government have introduced new KS4 floor standards combining attainment with progress measures and increasing the attainment threshold 5A*-C including E&M to 35%. It is expected that as a minimum standard, all schools should have at least 35% of pupils achieving 5 or more GCSEs at grade A*-C or equivalent including GCSEs in both English and mathematics and not be below the median school average for the percentage of pupils making expected progress between Key Stage 2 and Key Stage 4 in English and in mathematics. The median for pupils making expected progress in English is 74% and in mathematics is 66% in 2011. No Rotherham schools were below the new DfE Floor Standard in 2011. All schools were above 40% 5A*-C including E&M.	→	0.3	N/A	✓	✓	N/A	GREEN
8	NI79	Achievement of a Level 2 qualification by the age of 19	HIGH	74.40%	N/A	76.3%	The increase of 1.9% continues an upward trend in this indicator, however, Rotherham remains below the national average.	↑	76.3%	81.5%	N/A	✓	x	AMBER
9	NI80	Achievement of a Level 3 qualification by the age of 19	HIGH	43.70%	N/A	44.9%	An increase of 1.2% continues the upward trend in this indicator. Rotherham remains below the national average of 56.7%.	↑	45.5%	54.2%	N/A	x	x	RED
10	NI81	Inequality gap in the achievement of a Level 3 qualification by the age of 19	LOW	26%	N/A	25.0%	Against an increasing cohort number and increasing percentage of FSM-eligible learners, Rotherham has improved the attainment of L3 by 19 for this cohort, thus closing the inequality gap this year.	↑	26.5%	24.2%	N/A	✓	x	AMBER
11	NI82	Inequality gap in the achievement of a Level 2 qualification by the age of 19	LOW	25%	N/A	28.0%	The Rotherham gap in attainment at L2 by 19 has increased against an increased number of FSM eligible learners.	↓	24.4%	20.2%	N/A	x	x	RED
12	NI 86	Secondary schools judged as having good or outstanding standards of behaviour	HIGH	69%	75%	66%	No schools were inspected in the spring term 2012 therefore the percentage remains the same.	↓	76.7%	81.6%	x	x	x	RED
13	NI 87	Secondary school persistent absence rate	LOW	5.1%	4.3%	5.20%	Persistent Absence figure of 5.2% has exceeded the target of 4.3% for 2011/12. Unfortunately, due to budget restraints the Service has been significantly reduced having lost 4 Attendance Adviser posts who worked on strategies with schools giving advice and guidance to reduce PA.	↓	8.8%	8.4%	x	✓	✓	AMBER
14	NI 89	Reduction of number of schools judged as requiring special measures and improvement in time taken to come out of the category	LOW	5	0	2	The school that remained in special measures from the old OFSTED framework has been removed in March 2012. It was in SM for 25 months therefore this increases the average time in a category. 2 primary schools were placed in Special Measures under the new OFSTED framework in the Spring Term 2012.	↑	N/A	N/A	x	N/A	N/A	N/A

No.	Ref	Definition	Good Perf	10/11 Perf	11/12 Target	11/12 Outturn	Commentary	DOT (Yr on Yr)	Stat. Neigh.	National	On target	Met SN	Met National	RAG Status	
15	NI 92	Narrowing the gap between the lowest achieving 20% in the Early Years Foundation Stage Profile and the rest	LOW	33.5%	32.2%	33.30%	The gap was reduced in 2011 by 0.4%. This however, is 2% away from achieving the national average and 1% from achieving the local target. DFE have ceased to collect targets for EYFS outcomes.	↑	31.10%	31.40%	*	*	*	RED	
16	NI 93	Progression by 2 levels in English between Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2	HIGH	79.0%	95.0%	79%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This progression measure is now part of the DfE Floor Standards and schools are expected to be above the national median (87% in 2011). This indicator remained at 79%, the progress measure is well below the statutory targets set individually by schools. Nationally the progress measure remained at 82%, the gap to the national average is 3%. Support to schools is detailed in the delivery plan. 	→	84.2%	83.0%	*	*	*	RED	
17	NI 94	Progression by 2 levels in Maths between Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2	HIGH	78.3%	92.0%	79%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This progression measure is now part of the DfE Floor Standards and schools are expected to be above the national median (86% in 2011). This indicator increased by 0.7% in 2011, the progress measure is well below the statutory targets set individually by schools. Nationally the progress measure remained at 83%, the gap to the national average is 3%. Support to schools is detailed in the delivery plan. 	↑	83.7%	82.0%	*	*	*	RED	
18	NI 99	Looked after children reaching level 4 in English at Key Stage 2	HIGH	33.0%	45.5%	50.0%	Target exceeded strategies where in place to support meeting the target.	↑	57.80%	50%	✓	*	✓	GREEN	
19	NI 100	Looked after children reaching level 4 in Maths at Key Stage 2	HIGH	50.0%	54.5%	45.5%	Disappointing results, with two young people not achieving predictions.	↓	53.80%	48%	*	*	*	RED	
20	NI 101	Looked after children achieving 5 A*-C GCSEs (or equivalent) at Key Stage 4 (including English and Maths)	HIGH	26.9%	33.3%	4.2%	2011 performance of 4.2% comprised of 1 out of 24 young people achieving. The original prediction is set some time prior to the young people taking their exams and was set on a cohort of 30 and was a very challenging target. As of September 2011 this cohort had reduced to 24 with a number of the high achievers leaving care.	↓	23.3	12.80%	*	*	*	RED	
21	NI 102	Achievement gap between pupils eligible for free school meals and their peers achieving the expected level at Key Stages 2 and 4	LOW	KS2 - 23% KS4 - 31%	N/A N/A	KS2 - 26% KS4 - 32.1%	<p>KS2 – Rotherham gap has increased by 3%. The attainment for pupils eligible for FSM remains at 48% in 2011. However, the achievement of pupils not eligible for FSM increased from 71% to 74% hence the widening of the gap.</p> <p>KS2 – National gap was reduced by 1% in 2011 from 21% to 20%.</p> <p>58% of pupils that were eligible for FSM achieved L4+ in English and mathematics, this is 10% above the Rotherham average.</p> <p>KS4 – Rotherham gap increased by 1.2% in 2011. The attainment of pupils eligible for FSM increased by 4.9% (from 24.4% to 29.3%). However, pupils not eligible for FSM increased by 6.1% (from 55.3% to 61.4%) hence the widening of the gap.</p> <p>KS4 – National Gap was reduced by 0.1%. The gap in performance comparing LA averages to national averages in 2011 is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> pupils eligible for FSM - 5.4% pupils not eligible for FSM - 0.8% 	↓ ↓	22.4% 29.4%	21.3% 27.6%	N/A N/A	*	*	*	RED RED
22	NI 103	Special Educational Needs – statements issued within 26 weeks													
a	a	Excluding exceptions	HIGH	100.0%	95%	100.0%	103a) of the 22 total statements issued this quarter, if we exclude medical exceptions, 11 were issued within 26 weeks.	↑	99.8%	95%	✓	✓	✓	GREEN	
b	b	Including exceptions	HIGH	100.0%	94%	99.0%	103b) of the 22 total statements issued this quarter, including those with exceptions, all 22 were issued within 26 weeks.	↑	96.7%	88%	✓	✓	✓	GREEN	
23	NI 104	The Special Educational Needs (SEN)/non-SEN gap - achieving Key Stage 2 English and Maths threshold	LOW	56.1%	N/A	54.0%	<p>Rotherham – The SEN gap was reduced by 2% in 2011.</p> <p>National – The SEN gap was reduced by 1%.</p> <p>The difference between the Rotherham LA gap and the National gap was reduced to 2%.</p>	↑	53%	50.90%	N/A	*	*	RED	
24	NI 105	The Special Educational Needs (SEN)/non-SEN gap – achieving 5 A*-C GCSE inc. English and Maths	LOW	48.9%	N/A	50%	The attainment gap for Rotherham increased in 2011 by 1% to 50.0% compared to a national attainment gap of 45%.	↓	44.3%	46.5%	N/A	*	*	RED	

No.	Ref	Definition	Good Perf	10/11 Perf	11/12 Target	11/12 Outturn	Commentary	DOT (Yr on Yr)	Stat. Neigh.	National	On target	Met SN	Met National	RAG Status
25	NI 117	16 to 18 year olds who are not in education, training or employment (NEET)	LOW	6.7%	N/A	7.6%	Rotherham has achieved an outturn of 7.6% for the period November to January against a predicted 7.8%. The mean for statistical neighbours was marginally lower at 7.5%. The three month average for Not Knowns stands at 4.8% whereas the same for statistical neighbours is 8.3%. Rotherham has concentrated effort on ensuring data is as robust and current as possible given the addition of 19 year olds being included in the count. The three month average for In learning fw as 81.2% against a figure of 78.5% for the same period last year (this is based on recalculated data). The reduction of 4% from last years reported figure is explained by the changes in the DFE counting mechanisms, and is not a like for like comparison.	↓	7.5%	6.1%	N/A	*	*	RED
26	NI 148	Care leavers in employment, education or training	HIGH	70.6%	67%	67.7%	overall performance above target. In q4 9/10 young people are in EET. The majority in training or employment - both full and part time opportunities. The 1 young person not in EET is a new parent. 1 young person who was previously NEET is now on a full time training course.	↓	54.0%	61.0%	✓	✓	*	AMBER
Ensuring care and protection are available for those people who need it most														
27	NI 59	Percentage of initial assessments for children's social care carried out												
a	a	within 7 working days of referral	HIGH	82.4%	82.0%	81.9%	Slightly lower percentage impacted by in month performance for March but overall higher volume both in time and completed. Overall significantly higher than Stat Neighbours and National Average. Ten days now national measure	↑	69.7%	64.0%	*	✓	✓	AMBER
b	b	within 10 working days of referral	HIGH	84.7%	86.0%	86.6%	The Ten day measure is the national measure. Again higher volume completed than last year and more completed in time	↑	78.2%	77.2%	✓	✓	✓	GREEN
28	NI 60	Percentage of core assessments for children's social care that were carried out within 35 working days of their commencement	HIGH	79.6%	75.1%	69.4%	Although a downward direction of travel compared to last years percentage figure there are significantly more core assessments completed in time and overall	↑	80.0%	75.0%	*	*	*	RED
29	NI 61	Timeliness of placements of looked after children for adoption following an agency decision that the child should be placed for adoption	HIGH	67.6%	74.0%	50.0%	Downward direction of travel and fewer children adopted in 11/12 than 10/11	↓	75.1%	74.0%	*	*	*	RED
30	NI 62	Stability of placements of looked after children: number of placements	LOW	11.0%	9.5%	10.2%	Amber rating only in respect of local target. Lower than national average	↑	9.8%	10.7%	*	✓	✓	AMBER
31	NI 63	Stability of placements of looked after children: length of placement	HIGH	64.4%	68.0%	64.2%	Slightly lower than last year in both percentage and numbers. Validation issues against this measure led to over reporting through out the year which has now been addressed.	↓	65.5%	68.6%	*	*	*	RED
32	NI 64	Child protection plans lasting 2 years or more	LOW	4.9%	4.0%	2.2%	Very high performance against this measure. Top quartile banding for 10/11 is up to 4%.	↑	6.7%	6.0%	✓	✓	✓	GREEN
33	NI 65	Percentage of children becoming the subject of a Child Protection Plan for a second or subsequent time	LOW	8.8%	13.3%	11.8%	Although well within the national average target of 13.3% a higher number of children were re-registered in 11/12 than 10/11	↓	13.7%	13.3%	✓	✓	✓	GREEN
34	NI 66	Looked After Children cases which were reviewed within required timescales	HIGH		97.5%	98.0%	Improved performance against both percentage and volume	↑	92.0%	90.0%	✓	✓	✓	GREEN
35	NI 67	Percentage of child protection cases which were reviewed within required timescales	HIGH	100.0%	100%	100.0%	100% performance as per 10/11 out turn	↑	96.0%	97.1%	✓	✓	✓	GREEN
36	NI 68	Percentage of referrals to children's social care going on to initial assessment	HIGH	91.8%	87.6%	93.9%	Improved performance due to changes to front door processes	↑	77.1%	71.5%	✓	✓	✓	GREEN
37	NI 147	Care leavers in suitable accommodation	HIGH	97.1%	95.0%	93.5%	Under target, however still higher than national average. Underperformance relates to 2 young people as small cohort size creates large % variation.	↑	85.1%	90.0%	*	✓	✓	AMBER

No.	Ref	Definition	Good Perf	10/11 Perf	11/12 Target	11/12 Outturn	Commentary	DOT (Yr on Yr)	Stat. Neigh.	National	On target	Met SN	Met National	RAG Status
Helping create safe and healthy communities														
38	NI 52	Take up of school lunches												
a	a	Primary	HIGH	46.4%	49.2%	46.8%	The service has increased the overall take up of meals compared to 2010-11 although the significant increases achieved in previous years has not been replicated. Meal Numbers per day have risen but the impact was offset by the increase in number of pupils on roll. There has been a slight increase in the number of meals served impacting on the PI as numbers on roll reduced slightly. For both sectors the targets set reflect the average take up for our statistical neighbours – the service aims to achieve these levels; requiring to add 522 primary and 360 secondary meals per day	↑	49.2%	44.1%	*	*	✓	RED
b	b	Secondary	HIGH	35.4%	37.6%	35.7%		↑	45.8%	37.6%	*	*	*	RED
39	NI 55	Obesity among primary school age children in Reception												
a	a	Prevalence	LOW	10.5%	N/A	8%	Childhood Obesity review event and Performance Clinic held in 2011/12. Children's weight management services continue to be commissioned and seeing increased uptake. Obesity Strategy Group continues to promote access to both preventive and treatment services and activities. Risk to weight management services during PH transition to LA has been raised and is under review.	↑	9.8%	9.4%	N/A	✓	✓	GREEN
b	b	Coverage	HIGH	94.4%	N/A	98%		↑	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
40	NI 56	Obesity among primary school age children in Year 6												
a	a	Prevalence	LOW	20.0%	N/A	22%	Childhood Obesity review event and Performance Clinic held in 2011/12. Children's weight management services continue to be commissioned and seeing increased uptake. Obesity Strategy Group continues to promote access to both preventive and treatment services and activities. Risk to weight management services during PH transition to LA has been raised and is under review.	↓	20.3%	19.0%	N/A	*	*	RED
b	b	Coverage	HIGH	95.0%	N/A	97%		↑	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
41	NI 112	Under 18 conception rate	LOW	46.6	28.2	45.4	Data relates to 2010 Outturn. National TP Strategy is now finished and NHRMBC are working to review local priorities and allocation of funding to support TP prevention	↓	48.8	35.4	*	✓	*	AMBER
42	NI 113	Prevalence of Chlamydia in under 24 year olds												
a	a	Coverage	HIGH	29.7%	21.0%	13.40%	The number of tests outturned under target for 2011/12, which was anticipated. Rotherham CaSH are now operating the screening programme are contracted until end March 2013.	↓	N/A	N/A	*	N/A	N/A	N/A
b	b	Prevalence	LOW		8	1.00%	The Public Health Outcome Framework 2013-2016 has now been published which now has an indicator in relation to crude diagnosis rate which we will be expected to monitor	↑	N/A	N/A	✓	N/A	N/A	N/A

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS
--

1.	Meeting	Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families' Services
2.	Date:	19th September, 2012
3.	Title	Proposal for a strategic approach to respond to the DfE SEN Green Paper, 'Support and Aspirations; a New Approach to Special Educational Needs and Disability'.
4.	Programme Area:	Resources Directorate

5. Summary

This paper sets out a proposal for a project group to take forward work on responding to the requirements of the DfE SEN Green Paper, 'Support and Aspirations; a New Approach to Special Educational Needs and Disability'. Issues that require a strategic approach include the Education, Health and Care Plan (EH&CP), Personal Budgets, market facilitation and market management.

6. Recommendations

That the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families Services

- 6.1 Endorse the proposal for a strategic approach to respond to the DfE SEN Green Paper, 'Support and Aspirations; a New Approach to Special Educational Needs and Disability'.**
- 6.2 Receive further papers that report on the progress and outcomes of the project**

7. Proposals and Details

7.1 Green Paper for Disabled Children

On March 9th 2011, the DfE SEN Green Paper, 'Support and Aspirations; a New Approach to Special Educational Needs and Disability', was released;
<http://www.education.gov.uk/publications/standard/publicationDetail/Page1/CM%208027>

The Department's website stated;

"Every child deserves a fair start in life, with the best opportunity to succeed. Currently, life changes for the approximately two million children and young people in England who are identified as having a special educational need (SEN), or who are disabled, are disproportionately poor.

'Support and Aspirations: a New Approach to Special Educational Needs and Disability' makes wide-ranging proposals to the frustrations of children and young people, their families and the professionals who work with them.

The vision for reform set out in this green paper includes wide ranging proposals to improve outcomes for children and young people who are disabled or have SEN, minimise the adversarial nature of the system for families and maximise value for money. The Green Paper states:

"By 2014, our intention is that all families with the proposed 'Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP)' will be entitled to a personal budget. Subjecting to piloting, this would include funding for education and health support as well as social care."

The Green paper for Disabled Children will give us the opportunity to work with children, young people, their families and adults with disabilities. Within the Green Paper there are significant proposals for change to:

- better support life outcomes
- give parents confidence by giving them more control
- transfer power to professionals on the front line and to local communities

The 5 main areas of proposed changes are under the following headings:

- Early Identification and Support
- Giving Parents Control
- Learning and Achieving
- Preparing for Adulthood

- Services working together for families

The main points in relation to strategic commissioning from the Green Paper include:

- Supporting 0-25yr olds with disability or special educational needs
- Personal budgets option to families by 2014
- Early (and earlier) intervention and prevention
- Joint working – health, social care, education
- Partnerships – in and across agencies, communities and the Voluntary and Community Sector
- Parental participation – individual and strategic level through consultation
- Structural and cultural change necessary
- Focus on outcomes

7.2 Pathfinders and Pilots

There are a number of pathfinder pilots announced by the Minister for Children and Families to take forward the proposed changes and test the core elements of reform, including:

- A single education, health and care plan from birth to 25 years old, focusing on whether outcomes for disabled children and their parents have been improved.
- Personal budgets for parents of disabled children and those with SEN so they can choose which services best suit the needs of their children.
- Strong partnership between all local services and agencies working together to help disabled children and those with SEN.
- Improved commissioning, particularly through links to health reforms.
- The role of voluntary and community sector organisations and parents in a new system.
- The cost of reform.

Currently a number of local authorities are acting as pilots in two identified areas as follows:

- Developing a health, education, care plan from birth to 25 years
- Personal budgets

Learning from the pilot authorities has been published, 'The Final Evaluation Report – the IB process: Individual Budgets for families with disabled children. It is clear that the pilot LA's have faced a number of challenges particularly in delivery of Personal Budgets.

7.3 Proposal

The Green Paper DfE SEN Green Paper, 'Support and Aspirations; a New Approach to Special Educational Needs and Disability' offers the opportunity to develop a strategic, coordinated, partnership approach and to work strategically with our key partners to develop joint, integrated commissioning and service delivery to improve outcomes for disabled children and their families.

It is proposed here that a project group be set up as the overarching body to take forward work on responding to the requirements of the DfE SEN Green Paper, 'Support and Aspirations; a New Approach to Special Educational Needs and Disability'. Issues that require a strategic approach include the Education, Health and Care Plan (EH&CP), Personal Budgets, market facilitation and market management. The group will also need to consider the HR workforce implications in moving to increased choice and control through Personal Budgets and the opportunity for families to choose alternatives to in-house provision. These changes also provide a significant cultural challenge for our staff in shifting their thinking and practise around Personal Budgets.

There will be a number of task and finish groups, for example, Finance and the Resource Allocation System (RAS), Personal Budgets, Consultation, Commissioning, HR and Education. These groups will all report into the overarching Project Group to ensure a coordinated coherent approach across all partners, agencies and functions. There has been a significant amount of work already been undertaken in the SEN Assessment service on the new EHCP and this will be integrated into the work programme.

This project group will sit under the proposed Joint CYPS Commissioning Group the proposal and the draft terms of reference are currently in circulation for decision. The joint commissioning group in turn report to the CCG to the Children, Young People and Families Partnership and to the Health and Well Being Board.

Membership of the group will be drawn from Strategic Commissioning for CYPS, Disabled Children's service, Health – Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG), Education, finance, HR and the voluntary sector. There will be robust and comprehensive engagement of parents and carers in developing the way forward.

8. Finance

There are no financial implications arising from this report at this time however there may be future consideration of pooled budgets arising from any joint commissioning activity.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

That if the project approach is not adopted there is a risk that Rotherham's disabled children and families will not receive the highest quality of service along with improved outcomes.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

This approach will enable an integrated response to the emerging agenda for Disabled Children and their families

12. Background Papers and Consultation

Green Paper 'Support and Aspiration: A new approach to special educational needs and Disability'

Aiming High for Disabled Children

Statutory Duty to produce a Short Breaks statement

TLAP (Think Local Act Personal) (2011) – Making it Real

DH (2010) Equality and Excellence – Liberating the NHS

HMG (2007) 'Putting People First':

DH (2008) Independent Living Strategy

DH (2008) Commissioning for Personalisation: A Framework for Local Authority Commissioners

In Control (2008) Smart Commissioning: exploring the impact of personalisation on commissioning

Contact Name: Chrissy Wright, Strategic Commissioning Manager, 01709 822308, chrissy.wright@rotherham.gov.uk

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS
--

1.	Meeting	Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families' Services
2.	Date:	19th September, 2012
3.	Title:	Proposal for a Joint Health, Social Care & Education Children, Young People & Families Commissioning Group
4.	Programme Area:	Resources Directorate RMBC

5. Summary:

This paper sets out a proposal for a joint NHS and RMBC Children, Young People's and Families Commissioning Group that will sit alongside the Children, Young People & Families Partnership, is accountable to the Health and Well Being Board and has the purpose of taking forward a strategic approach for commissioning of CYPS services and meeting recommendations set out in the Peer Review of 2011 and the recent 2012 Inspection of CYPS by Ofsted. The membership will be drawn from key stakeholders and partnership agencies across the borough including NHS Clinical Commissioning Group, Social Care, Education and the Voluntary Sector. The proposed Terms of Reference are attached to this report.

6. Recommendations:

That the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families' Services: -

- 6.1 Note the opportunities to progress a joint approach for commissioning**
- 6.2 Endorse the proposal for a Children, Young People's and Families Commissioning Group as set out at 7.3**
- 6.3 Agree the proposed Terms of Reference attached to this report**
- 6.4 Agree that this proposal should be presented to the CYPFP for endorsement**

7. Proposals and Details:

7.1 Background:

The corporate review of Commissioning, Policy and Performance in 2011 brought CYPS commissioning together with Adults Health and Social Care commissioning in a corporate function within Chief Executives and then the Resources Directorate.

The Health and Well Being Board is now well established as a decision making body with a strategy that is out for consultation. There is an established governance structure that includes an Adults Board as the commissioning body for Health and Social care for Adults.

7.2 Current Position:

As commissioners our current practice is to jointly produce the Joint Strategic Needs Analysis (JSNA) which is overseen by the Health and Well Being Board and to contribute to other key analysis and planning documents. Currently we produce strategic commissioning plans which are quite distinct for Neighbourhoods and Adults Services (NAS) Directorate, Public Health and Children and Young Peoples (CYPS) Directorate and with our key partner the Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and in Public Health.

It is clear that Rotherham's NHS and RMBC plan well together as partners and there is established good practise in joint commissioning for Adults, that sits under the joint Adults Board, for the following services:

- Intermediate Care
- Equipment Services
- Occupational Health Services
- Mental Health
- Drugs and Alcohol misuse

To date there is no group or body where the strategic direction of commissioning for CYPS services across Health, Public Health, Social Care and Education is considered, information is shared and priorities are taken forward within a partnership approach.

At the present time as commissioners in NHS and in RMBC work closely together on the following commissioned services for CYPS or Families:

- CAMHs
- Substance Misuse
- Disability Short Breaks

This is a minimal position and of detriment to moving forward as a borough and as partners to improve outcomes for all. There are, however, real opportunities to achieve 'quick wins' in jointly commissioning services such as for Children with Complex needs and across the voluntary sector.

Development of joint commissioning plans against the national priorities and local priorities of the Health and Well Being Board, the CCG and the 29 outcomes is a key concern going forward. For example, DfE SEN Green Paper, 'Support and Aspirations; a New Approach to Special Educational Needs and Disability'. demands that the Local Authority works in partnership to take forward Personal Budgets for children and young people. The Green Paper states:

"By 2014, our intention is that all families with the proposed 'Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP) ' will be entitled to a personal budget. Subjecting to piloting, this would include funding for education and health support as well as social care."

There will need to be a coordinated joint commissioning approach across all agencies to ensure that the requirements of this Green Paper are met.

7.3 Proposal:

That a commissioning group is set up with the following responsibilities and powers as set out in the Terms of Reference:

- Agree commissioning plans to deliver shared outcomes contained within HWB Strategy
- Agree overarching commissioning principles and relationships management
- Ensure that commissioning plans are informed by child/parent/carer centred approaches and take account of real life experience
- Share commissioning priorities and seek opportunities for integrated commissioning across Health, Social Care and Schools
- Consider implications of intelligence from JSNA, local and national reviews
- Contribute to the CYPS local account
- Make recommendations about commissioning priorities to HWB Board through appropriate local authority and NHS decision making groups
- Review progress against outcomes contained within HWB Strategy
- Review progress against the combined priorities of the HWB Strategy
- Develop responses to emerging issues and recommend remedial action/alternative approaches to achieve shared outcomes in the light of changing circumstances
- Identify opportunities to support emerging markets such as Personalisation and Individual Budgets for Disabled Children
- Deliver shared outcomes set out in the following strategic documents
 - HWB Strategy
 - RMBC Corporate Plan – the 29 outcomes
 - NHS Operating Framework

Membership of the group is proposed to include strategic commissioning officers, representatives of Children, Young People and Family services, School

Effectiveness, Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG), Public Health and the Voluntary Sector. The draft Terms of Reference are attached to this paper for convenience.

The Governance arrangements are that reporting is to the Children, Young People's and Families Partnership, the HWBB and into the Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group as appropriate. There will also be engagement with and reporting into other boards, groups and bodies as required, in particular Children Safeguarding Board to ensure that keeping children and young people safe is at the heart of commissioning activities.

The initial work of the group will be to develop a Commissioning Strategy for Children, Young People and their Families. A number of task and finish groups will be commenced and an example of these will be a joint health, social care and education approach for children with complex needs. The strategy will be short and meaningful stating a clear plan for the next three years.

8. Finance:

There are no financial considerations relating to this paper at this time however should this work progress to combined commissioning there will be pooling of budgets as defined under the Health Act (2000)

9. Risks and Uncertainties:

That

- Not to develop a joint commissioning group for CYPS and Families will result in fragmented commissioning
- Not to develop a joint approach would result in the reduction of opportunities to decrease duplication, achieve efficiencies and improve outcomes

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications:

The Health and Well Being Board will have a duty to develop the JSNA. The DH has published guidance on the future development of this piece of work under the new arrangements.

The Joint Health and Well Being Strategy is out for consultation. Government are currently consulting on the proposals in relation to the Public Health White Paper, including commissioning, funding and the proposed outcomes framework.

The DfE SEN Green Paper, 'Support and Aspirations; a New Approach to Special Educational Needs and Disability' .is expected to pass into law this Autumn.

11. Background Papers and Consultation:

CYPS commissioning priorities
NAS commissioning priorities

ACP- CCG annual cycle
Children's and Young Peoples Plan
Corporate Plan on a page
Children, Young People and Families Partnership Commissioning Plan
Joint Health & Well-being Strategy

**Contact Name: Chrissy Wright, Strategic Commissioning Manager, 01709
822308, chrissy.wright@rotherham.gov.uk**

Name of Group	CHILDREN, YOUNG PEOPLE & FAMILIES JOINT COMMISSIONING GROUP	
Accountable to	Health and Well Being Board Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group Rotherham MBC Cabinet Member for Children and Families CYPFP	
Composition Of Group	Strategic Commissioning Manager, Resources Directorate	RMBC (Co-Chair)
	Assistant Chief Officer	RCCG (Co-Chair)
	Strategic Commissioning Officers	RMBC
	Public Health Consultant	RMBC
	Head of Early Years	RMBC
	Chief Executive of Voluntary Action Rotherham	Vol Sector
	Head of Partnerships	NHSR
	Head of Contracts & Service Improvement – Mental Health	NHSR
Quorum & Voting	Quorum achieved when Strategic Commissioning Manager and Assistant Chief Officer (or their substitutes) and one further member are present.	
Communities of interest	All Children, Young People and Family groups where there is agreement to commission services.	
Responsibilities and Powers	<p>Make recommendations about commissioning priorities to HWB Board through appropriate local authority and NHS decision making groups</p> <p>Agree commissioning plans to deliver shared outcomes contained within HWB Strategy</p> <p>Ensure that commissioning plans are informed by child/parent/carer centred approaches and take account of real life experience</p> <p>Seek opportunities for integrated commissioning across Health and Social Care</p>	
	<p>Review progress against outcomes contained within HWB Strategy</p> <p>Consider implications of intelligence from JSNA, local and national reviews</p> <p>Develop responses to emerging issues and recommend remedial action/alternative approaches to achieve shared outcomes in the light of changing circumstances</p>	
Key outcome	<p>Deliver shared outcomes set out in the following strategic documents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HWBB strategy • RMBC Corporate Plan – 29 outcomes • NHS Operating Framework • 	

Meeting Frequency	Bi-monthly
Operational arrangements	All agenda item submitted 10 days before the Board
	Papers distributed 1 week before the meeting All members to nominate a substitute who will receive papers
	Terms of Reference reviewed every two years
Reporting arrangements	Health and Well Being Board Cabinet Member for Children, Young People & Families CYPFP Clinical Commissioning Group - NHSR
Review	Every two years

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS
--

1.	Meeting:-	Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families' Services
2.	Date:-	19th September, 2012
3.	Title:-	Independent Chair of Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children Board – Waiving of Standing Orders
4.	Directorate:-	Children and Young People's Services

5. Summary

The role of Chair of the Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB) should be undertaken by an individual who is independent of the local agencies so that the LSCB can exercise its local challenge function effectively as defined by section 3.52 of Working Together to Safeguard Children (March 2010). Section 3.62 of the same documents reflects on the importance on 'consistency and continuity of membership' of LSCB's.

The RLSCB Chair has been key in driving developments in safeguarding across all agencies and in particular lessons learned from recent serious case reviews. This work has contributed to improvements across agencies as reflected in inspection outcomes.

The current contract ended on 27th August 2012 and a waiver is sought to extend the contract by 12 months with the intention of ensuring momentum and continuity to the ongoing improvements to safeguard children in the Borough.

6. Recommendations

The Cabinet Member is recommended to:

- 6.1 Waive (in accordance with Standing Order 49 - Tender invitation and Receipt of tenders) for provision of Independent Chair of Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children Board for the period 27th August 2012 until 27th August 2013.**

7. Proposals and Details

7.1 Independent Chair– Current Position

The Independent Chair was appointed in August 2009 following a tendering / recruitment exercise. Since this appointment (and in compliance with section 3.53 of working together) the Independent Chair has ensured that the Board operates effectively and has acted as the independent voice for the RLSCB. The Chair has the standing, objectivity and expertise that command the respect and support of all partners.

A 360 degree appraisal of the Chair's performance has recently been undertaken which has had a successful outcome and identified few areas for development for the next 12 months. An extension is sought to ensure these developments are implemented and the RLSCB is in a stronger position to ensure children are protected and to face future inspections.

8. Finance

The current provision of Independent Chair costs £20,000 per annum. This represents a 9% (£2,000) saving on the previous year which has been ratified by the RLSCB in its 2012/13 budget.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

Should the contract not be extended a period of uncertainty and inconsistency may be experienced by the RLSCB which may be felt across all agencies.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

This role has a major impact on the four Big Things within the revised Children and Young People's Plan clearly Keeping Children and Young People Safe is the main focus but it also contributes to Prevention and Early Intervention, Tackling Inequality and Transforming Rotherham Learning.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

N/A

Contact Name:-

Karen Potts

Think Family Business Development Officer

Ext. 54822

email karen-c&f.pottst@rotherham.gov.uk

Document is Restricted

Document is Restricted